Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

DOD ACQUISITION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Report No. 94-200 September 30, 1994

Department of Defense

Additional Copies

Copies of the report can be obtained from the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8939 (DSN) 664-8939 or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Inspector General, Department of Defense
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

DoD Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, call the DoD Hotline at (800) 424-9098 or write to the DoD Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of writers and callers is fully protected.

Acronyms

ACAT	Acquisition Category
AIS	Automated Information System
APDB	Acquisition Program Data Base
ASN(RDA)	Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition)
CARS	Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System
CIM	Corporate Information Management
DAES	Defense Acquisition Executive Summary
DAPMO	Data Administration Program Management Office
GAO	General Accounting Office
MARCORP	Marine Corps Systems Command
NAVAIR	Naval Air Systems Command
NAVSEA	Naval Sea Systems Command
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
PEO	Program Executive Officer
RCDB	Research Development and Acquisition Consolidated Data Base
SPAWAR	Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command
USD(A)	Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition
USD(A&T)	Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202

September 30, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY

SUBJECT: DoD Acquisition Information Management (Report No. 94-200)

We are providing this report for your review and comments. This report is the third in a series of reports resulting from our audit of the milestone review process for Component-managed acquisition programs.

We considered your comments on a draft of this report in preparing the final report. Those comments met the intent of our recommendation; however, an estimated date for completing planned action was not provided. Therefore, in accordance with DoD Directive 7650.3, "Followup on General Accounting Office, DoD Inspector General, and Internal Audit Reports," September 5, 1989, we request that you provide an estimated completion date for planned action by November 29, 1994.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. If you have any questions on this report, please contact Mr. John E. Meling, Program Director, at (703) 604-9091 (DSN 664-9091) or Mr. Jack D. Snider, Project Manager, at (703) 604-9087 (DSN 664-9087). Appendix G lists the distribution of this report. Audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 94-200 **September 30, 1994**
(Project No. 3AE-0061.02)

DOD ACQUISITION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction. The Defense Information Management Program was established to provide accurate and consistent information to decisionmakers. Acquisition information systems assist managers in determining and prioritizing resource requirements, planning and executing acquisition programs, directing and controlling the acquisition review process, contracting, monitoring the status of approved programs, and reporting to Congress.

Objectives. DoD acquisition information management was reviewed as a part of our ongoing audit of the milestone review process for Component-managed acquisition programs. The audit assessed the adequacy of the information provided to DoD Component milestone decision authorities in support of major milestone and program reviews and evaluated internal controls related to the objective.

Audit Results. Information management within the DoD acquisition system needs improvement. DoD acquisition information management is fragmented among the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Military Departments and by program acquisition categories. Periodic program performance measurement and status reporting is required only on major Defense acquisition programs. As a result, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, and program executive officials relied excessively on program reviews and briefings instead of on a real-time management information flow. The process of identifying risks and implementing corrective actions is lengthened by using the current system; performance measurement and reporting are impeded.

Internal Controls. The audit did not identify any material internal control weaknesses. Internal controls assessed are summarized in Part I of this report.

Potential Benefits of Audit. Implementation of the recommendation will ensure compliance with information management and data administration policies and provide more timely information to DoD decisionmakers (Appendix E).

Summary of Recommendation. We recommended that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology establish improved, state-of-the-art information management and data administration programs for the DoD acquisition system based on a single integrated information system and standardization of data elements.

Management Comments. We received comments to a draft of this report from the Director, Acquisition Program Integration, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. The Director stated that the finding would be a valuable input to an assessment of Systems-Acquisition-Management Corporate-Information-Management assessment that was commencing. However, the Director could not commit to the recommendation until a decision was made either to

consolidate existing information systems and implement a migration system or to develop new information systems. The complete text of the Director's comments is in Part IV.

Audit Response. The Director's comments met the intent of our recommendation. However, since a commitment cannot be made to the audit recommendation until management makes an information-systems decision, we request that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology provide an estimated date of completion for the action by November 29, 1994.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Part I - Introduction 1

Background 2
Objectives 2
Scope and Methodology 3
Internal Controls 3
Prior Audits and Other Reviews 4

Part II - Finding and Recommendation 5

DoD Acquisition Information Management 6

Part III - Additional Information 19

Appendix A. Definitions of Terms 20
Appendix B. Prior Audits and Other Reviews 23
Appendix C. Results of Program Executive Officer Survey 27
Appendix D. Navy's Acquisition Program Data Base 29
Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit 30
Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted 31
Appendix G. Report Distribution 33

Part IV - Management Comments 35

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Comments 36

The Acquisition Management Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD, prepared this report.

Part I - Introduction

Background

Secretary's Direction. On October 13, 1993, the Deputy Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum reiterating the full commitment of DoD to the "improvements, efficiencies, and productivity that are the essence of Corporate Information Management (CIM)." The CIM initiative focuses on functional process improvement, migration systems, and data standardization. (See Appendix A for definitions of terms in this report.) The Deputy Secretary also emphasized the need for complete data standardization DoD-wide. Further, the memorandum requested that the addressees select migration systems by March 31, 1994, with follow-on DoD-wide transition to the selected systems over a period not to exceed 3 years. However, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD[A&T]) plans to select a migration system for its particular functional areas in November 1994.

Information Management. Within the DoD information management environment, DoD Directive 8000.1, "Defense Information Management Program," October 27, 1992, establishes broad and centralized information management authority for the Defense Secretary's principal staff assistants. Principal staff assistants are assigned distinct authority and are responsible for supporting information systems for their respective functional areas. This policy was needed to begin elimination of fragmented, duplicative, inefficient, and ineffective methods in which DoD Components operated. Adequate information management will provide the means for data standardization, continuity, increased efficiency, and reduced costs.

Data Administration. The DoD Directive 8320.1, "DoD Data Administration," September 26, 1991, states that data administration is the responsibility for definition, organization, supervision, and protection of data within an organization. Data administration should support DoD operations and decisionmaking with data that meet the needs of availability, accuracy, timeliness, and quality and encourage horizontal, as well as vertical, sharing of data in DoD.

Objectives

We reviewed DoD acquisition information management as a part of our ongoing audit of the milestone review process for Component-managed acquisition programs. The audit assessed the adequacy of the information provided to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Military Departments' milestone decision authorities in support of major milestone and program reviews and evaluated internal controls related to the objective. We found that each Military Department did not have a composite list of consistent program information. This problem was caused, in part, by the lack of a common database of program information within each Military Department. Therefore, we are reporting this issue separately because action is needed on the identified issues before completion of our overall audit.

Scope and Methodology

We conducted this audit from May 1993 through May 1994 and reviewed data dated from September 1991 through May 1994. To accomplish the objective, we:

o assessed whether the Military Departments were administering acquisition program data in accordance with DoD Directive 8000.1 and DoD Directive 8320.1,

o discussed issues relating to the development of a DoD-wide acquisition information management system with Office of the Secretary of Defense and DoD Component personnel,

o surveyed Program Executive Officers' organizations to determine what type of management information systems exist currently and what type of information would be required in such a system, and

o visited several buying commands to obtain a demonstration and documentation of systems being used.

The audit was made in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD, and accordingly included such tests of internal controls as were deemed necessary. We did not rely on computer-generated data to support our finding and recommendation. Appendix F lists the organizations visited or contacted.

Internal Controls

Internal Controls Evaluated. We evaluated internal controls related to the effectiveness of the oversight of DoD acquisition programs and the availability of key program information to decisionmakers. The DoD Instruction 5000.2, "Defense Acquisition Policies and Procedures," February 23, 1991; DoD Manual 5000.2-M, "Defense Acquisition Management Documentation and Reports," February 23, 1991; DoD Directive 8000.1; and DoD Directive 8320.1 specify those controls and procedures.

Internal Control Weakness Not Identified. The audit did not identify any material internal weakness, as defined by DoD Directive 5010.38, "Internal Management Control Program," April 14, 1987. Existing internal controls, if properly implemented, were sufficient to preclude the deficiencies noted in this report. As part of this audit, we did not examine the effectiveness of implementation of the DoD Internal Management Control Program for DoD Component-managed programs because our objectives were limited to DoD acquisition information management. Our summary report on the overall audit will include our assessment of the internal controls for Component-managed programs.

Prior Audits And Other Reviews

Since 1989, no reports directly related to the audit objective have been issued. However, concerning the CIM initiative, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued four reports and the Inspector General, DoD, issued a program evaluation. The reports and evaluation are synopsized in Appendix B.

Part II - Finding and Recommendation

DoD Acquisition Information Management

Acquisition information management within the DoD acquisition system needs improvement. Acquisition information management is fragmented among the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and Military Departments and by acquisition category (ACAT). These conditions exist because DoD lacks an single integrated acquisition information management and data administration system for ACAT I through IV Defense programs. As a result, USD(A&T) and DoD Component Acquisition Executive officials relied excessively on program reviews and briefings instead of on an acquisition information management system. Responsible acquisition officials indicated that the limitations of the current information system lengthened the process of identifying risks and implementing corrective actions and impeded performance measurement and reporting.

Background

Defense Information Management Program. The DoD Directive 8000.1 provides policies and procedures for the Defense Information Management Program and requires that:

o accurate and consistent information be made available expeditiously to decisionmakers to effectively execute the DoD missions;

o information systems are planned, acquired, developed, and implemented from a DoD-wide perspective to ensure consistency of information and processes in and across functional areas;

o the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) develop and maintain information management models that present an integrated top-level representation of DoD processes, information flows, and standard DoD-wide data, in consultation with DoD Components;

o the Director, Defense Information Systems Agency, develop and manage the DoD Data Administration Program; and

o heads of the DoD Components establish a Component information management program to integrate, implement, and oversee DoD information principles, polices, procedures, programs, and standards.

DoD Data Administration. The DoD Directive 8320.1 establishes policy for DoD data administration and states that data administration applies to all information systems of the DoD Components, regardless of whether those systems share data with other systems. This Directive further states that data administration be aggressively implemented in ways:

o to provide clear, concise, consistent, and easily accessible data DoD-wide;

o to standardize and register data elements to meet the requirements for data sharing and interoperability among information systems throughout DoD; and

o to minimize the cost and time required to transform, translate, or research differently described but otherwise identical data.

Data administration supports DoD operations and decisionmaking with data that meet the needs in terms of availability, accuracy, timeliness, and quality and to structure the information systems to encourage horizontal, as well as vertical, sharing of data in DoD as well as with other Government Agencies.

Responsibility for DoD Acquisition System. The DoD Directive 5134.1, "Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition (USD[A]),"* September 30, 1992, defines the DoD acquisition system and the responsibilities of the USD(A). This Directive states that USD(A) has full responsibility for supervising the performance of the DoD acquisition system. It specifically states that USD(A) shall establish and maintain management information and reporting systems to fulfill his responsibilities.

Adequate Acquisition Information Management

Acquisition information provided to DoD decisionmakers is not consistently cohesive, accurate, timely, and complete. The principal existing acquisition program reporting mechanism, the Defense Acquisition Executive Summary, has limitations concerning the dissemination of acquisition information on major and nonmajor programs. USD(A&T) officials agreed that USD(A&T) does need better information management of ACAT I programs; however, they had some reservations about the extent of improvement that is feasible.

Acquisition Categories II Through IV Programs. USD(A&T) officials indicated that, according to DoD Instruction 5000.2, USD(A&T) delegates responsibility for managing ACAT II through IV programs; therefore, the need for ACAT II through IV program status visibility at USD(A&T) level does not exist. However, despite milestone decision authority resting with the DoD Component Acquisition Executive and below for ACAT II through IV programs, we note that USD(A&T) still has ultimate responsibility for the overall DoD acquisition system and all acquisition programs. A DoD-wide integrated acquisition information management system should incorporate all acquisition programs for which the USD(A&T) is ultimately responsible.

*Renamed Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD[A&T]) in November 1993. On November 3, 1993, the Director for Administration and Management issued a coordination memorandum and a draft update of this Directive.

Information System Capabilities. USD(A&T) officials stated that the information system should, at a minimum, include the acquisition program baseline. The DoD Manual 5000.2-M states that measurement of a program's progress and status is not possible using only the approved acquisition program baseline and must consider all program documentation. Information considered useful to major decision authorities must be identified. The information management system must not simply establish a data library but should meet the information and communication needs of program managers and decisionmakers. Considering the alternative of requiring the Military Departments to establish integrated information systems, USD(A&T) officials stated that they will not dictate how the Army, Navy, and Air Force should establish their respective information systems; however, an OSD system should be compatible and interoperable with the Military Departments' systems. USD(A&T) officials expressed concern that a USD(A&T) mandate to establish a system could be detrimental because not all prospective users have the necessary equipment. This concern was often expressed during the ongoing DoD process of standardizing systems and, in our opinion, does not justify continuing with poor information management.

DoD-Wide Acquisition Information Management System Consequences. USD(A&T) officials foresee the following primary pitfalls in implementing a DoD-wide integrated acquisition information management system.

Cultural Issue. USD(A&T) officials indicated that the Military Departments would resist establishing an integrated information management system. Specifically, it was speculated that the Military Departments do not want to provide OSD access to information on their programs. We have no means of assessing the validity of those concerns, but parochial interests and unwillingness to share data should not be allowed to impede more effective program management.

Status Quo. Although the Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System (CARS) essentially supports reporting functions, USD(A&T) officials stated that CARS also provides program managers and OSD officials with information to sufficiently manage and oversee ACAT I programs. USD(A&T) officials suggested expanding the use of CARS to apply to all ACAT programs throughout the Military Departments. Currently, CARS software is located at more than 100 major Defense acquisition program offices. We surveyed the respective Program Executive Officer organizations (Appendix C). In response to our survey, the organizations identified CARS and other unique information management software. Although we did not assess that software, we are convinced that a valid requirement exists for improved information management in the DoD acquisition system. Sufficient justification exists to implement a detailed analytical process for assessing user requirements and designing and implementing an acquisition information management system, including comprehensive cost-benefit analyses on each capability being considered.

Reporting Versus Information Management System. Several Program Executive Officer organizations that responded to our survey referred to the CARS as their management information system. However, the CARS is essentially a reporting mechanism to generate quarterly Defense Acquisition

Executive Summary (DAES) reports on major Defense acquisition programs. The DAES report is designed to provide USD(A&T) and DoD Component Acquisition Executives with an early warning of potential and actual problems. To prepare and generate DAES reports, program managers of major acquisition programs use the DAES module of the CARS. The program managers select and input program data into the module, generate and print the report, and create and copy the DAES data files to floppy data disks that are mailed with printed reports to the USD(A&T).

The DAES report and associated review process used by the USD(A&T) have numerous shortcomings that impede effective program management oversight. Program information captured in the report is submitted to decisionmakers at a very condensed level. Further, because DAES reports are provided on a quarterly basis, their information usually is quite aged and requires requests for current information. DoD decisionmakers would benefit from an information system that would enable them to detect potential problems and resolve them before they get out of hand. The CARS does not provide this capability because program information entered into this system reflects the status of acquisition programs, based primarily on events that are at least 2 months old.

Reliable and Timely Information. Users of the DAES information, such as the Offices of the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, and the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, indicated that current information systems need improvement because information, when reported, is not reliable, timely, accurate, and available.

Office of the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation. An official within the Office of the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, stated that information reported in the DAES report is not reliable because the information changes dramatically by the time the report is prepared and submitted. The official indicated that later requests for current information are usually necessary.

Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. Officials within the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense emphasized that better program acquisition as well as budgeting information is needed. Specifically, officials expressed a need for:

- timely, accurate, and available information;
- standardized budgeting and program acquisition information for the same programs; and
- an improved DoD Future Years Defense Program database, which is currently cumbersome and requires a lot of time to update.

Restrictions on Information. Relying on the DAES report also limited the oversight and sharing of program information. The DAES report only provides periodic program performance measurement and status reporting on major Defense acquisition programs, excluding all ACAT II through IV

programs. Although oversight and management for ACAT II through IV programs are the primary responsibility of the DoD Component Acquisition Executives, USD(A&T) has overall responsibility for the programs.

Effectiveness of Military Department Information Systems

The Military Departments do not have effective acquisition information management systems.

Army Acquisition Information Management. The Acquisition Community Information Technology Activity (the Activity) is the organization within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) responsible for providing automation, telecommunications, networking, and records management support and services to the Army Acquisition Executive. The Activity also provides communications support to other Army Headquarters elements, the acquisition community, and selected DoD staff elements. The Army developed the Research, Development and Acquisition Consolidated Data Base (RCDB), located in Radford, Virginia.

Research, Development and Acquisition Consolidated Data Base. The RCDB contains all Army programs' acquisition funding profiles and designated reports, such as the Program Objective Memorandum and the President's Budget. However, the RCDB did not include the ACAT status of all Army programs. Specifically, Army officials within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) indicated that distinctions between ACAT III and IV programs and modification programs have not been established, resulting in incomplete program identification.

The primary objective of the RCDB is to facilitate the Army Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution System. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) uses this automated information system to prepare, submit, and support the Army budget. The RCDB contains procurement program dollars and quantities by item as these elements will appear in the procurement and budget documents. The RCDB generates reports, computational routines, data extracts, and routines to format data for external systems that are geared toward budget preparation.

Data Standardization. The Acting Director, Acquisition Community Information Technology Activity, indicated that standardizing data as well as rectifying inherent problems within the acquisition process are instrumental to establishing a DoD-wide integrated information system.

Navy Acquisition Information Management. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition) (ASN[RDA]) used an in-house contractor to develop an on-line networked, centralized,

acquisition program database as a top-level management tool that includes all Navy ACAT I through IV programs. The Navy refers to this acquisition network as the Acquisition Program Data Base (APDB) (Appendix D).

Identifying a Need. The APDB was developed in response to the revised DoD Instruction 5000 series and has been operative since October 1992. The need had been identified to develop a centralized database that would facilitate the generation and dissemination of an official list of all Navy acquisition programs. The Office of the ASN(RDA) found that the Marine Corps Systems Command (MARCORP), Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR), Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), and Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) did not have a database that adequately captured information on ACAT I through IV programs.

Acquisition Program Data Base Users. The acquisition support organizations of the MARCORP, NAVAIR, NAVSEA, and SPAWAR were either using or planning to use the APDB. We contacted or visited the acquisition support organizations of these four buying Commands to determine whether they use the APDB and other databases to better manage and provide significant information to decisionmakers on ACAT I through IV programs. The Commands were beginning to come on-line to the APDB.

Marine Corps Systems Command. As of September 9, 1994, the MARCORP had not begun using the APDB; however, it expects to start when it receives the appropriate equipment on order. Further, a MARCORP official indicated that program managers did not use an information management system that would have enabled them to better manage their programs and provide decisionmakers with accurate, consistent, and timely information on acquisition programs. Specifically, program managers either used individually selected software packages or used pencil and paper to manage, obtain, and relay pertinent information. According to the MARCORP official, their existing process adversely impacts getting accurate, consistent, and timely program information to decisionmakers and requires more time to coordinate efforts. The official indicated that, if all information were input into an integrated acquisition information management system, program management, assessment, and reporting could then be done more efficiently. The official expressed a need to also consider the functionality of such a system for budget preparation.

Naval Air Systems Command. NAVAIR acquisition support personnel indicated that the APDB, as a management tool, contains less current information than the information available at the acquisition support office or from program managers. Therefore, the APDB has little value for them. This lack of timely information indicates that program managers and decisionmakers may possess different information about an acquisition program. Further, based on how program managers and the various support groups judge those differences, program managers and decisionmakers may not be fully informed about program performance and system indicators. Under the current information exchange process, decisionmakers and program managers rely upon source documents for significant information on programs instead of the APDB.

Naval Sea Systems Command. The NAVSEA Acquisition Support Office (the Support Office) gained access to the APDB network in December 1993. The Support Office had developed and was also using its own database, including all NAVSEA ACAT I through IV programs. The Director of the Acquisition Support Office planned to use both databases since they contain similar information.

Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command. During our visit to SPAWAR, the Test and Evaluation Review Division (the Division) of SPAWAR was the only SPAWAR organization that previously had access to the APDB and was awaiting reactivation to the APDB. The Division coordinator, who was responsible to the SPAWAR Commander for ensuring that all research and development programs were properly tested and ready for production, indicated that the Division had utilized the APDB for about 3 months but was disconnected from the APDB in January 1994 when the Division relocated. The Division was awaiting a security certification to be reconnected to the APDB. To perform his job when not connected to the APDB, the coordinator used a contractor-developed database that utilized an off-the-shelf software package.

The SPAWAR acquisition program reporting and assessment process is not adequate. Specifically, decisionmakers are not provided accurate, consistent, and timely information. As a result, in November 1993, the Deputy Commander for SPAWAR, as chairperson of the SPAWAR Acquisition Process Quality Management Board, established the Program Review Working Group to resolve the problem of reporting inaccurate, incomprehensible, and untimely acquisition information. The working group analyzed the processes used by SPAWAR organizations. In June 1994, the working group proposed a new SPAWAR acquisition information database that will be interoperable with the APDB to report program information and, therefore, will provide single-entry data reporting. SPAWAR plans to have its database operating by November 1994.

Acquisition Program Data Base Availability. A Navy program manager indicated that his office had not used the APDB to manage his program because his office had not yet received a security certification for access to the database. The program manager believed that even if the APDB had been available, it was not a management tool, but a reporting system. The program manager noted that managers need a system to use as a management tool, enabling them to get to their next milestone with the capability to require that each data entry occurs only once.

Acquisition Program Data Base Data Standardization. ASN(RDA) officials expressed concern about problems caused by non-standard data elements. For example, when non-standard data elements are used in reports to decisionmakers and Congress, time and money are spent meeting with Congress to clarify that data elements reported under two different names are actually the same item. The Office of the ASN(RDA) must then clarify for decisionmakers and Congress that the Navy is not requesting funding for two distinct items. Also, data standardization facilitates the establishment, continued use, and support of an integrated system; otherwise, users of the system tend to lose confidence and interest in the system.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition) Guidance. The Assistant Secretary's overall goals are to eliminate fragmented databases and duplication of efforts within the Navy acquisition community and reduce the number of systems acquisition managers must update. The APDB is maintained by the Resources and Evaluation Directorate, Office of the ASN(RDA). Until recently, ASN(RDA) had not officially directed that acquisition organizations use the APDB. However, the ASN(RDA) issued a memorandum, "Connectivity to the Department of the Navy Acquisition Program Database," May 2, 1994, that directed each Systems Commander, Program Executive Officer, and Direct Reporting Program Manager to appoint an organizational coordinator to establish secure on-line connectivity with the APDB. Also, the ASN(RDA) directed that by May 20, 1994, each coordinator provide her with a plan of action and milestones to establish by September 30, 1994, organizational-wide connectivity with the APDB. According the special assistant to the ASN(RDA), as of May 20, 1994, all coordinators had submitted plans and milestones for their respective organizations. This action by the ASN(RDA) demonstrated the kind of leadership and management commitment needed throughout the DoD acquisition community to establish an adequate information management program and to overcome cultural issues and operational obstacles that currently hinder effective and efficient management of acquisition information and other DoD resources.

Although the APDB was not being widely used throughout the Navy acquisition community during the period of our review, current and proposed attributes of the database are positive steps towards establishing an adequate information management system within the Navy. After all required Navy acquisition organizations are linked to and using the APDB, the Navy will generate and handle fewer documents.

Air Force Acquisition Information Management. The Office of the Deputy Assistant of Air Force (Management Policy and Program Integration) coordinates the reporting efforts on Air Force programs to the Air Force Service Acquisition Executive. This organization prepared the "Headquarters, United States Air Force Program Management Directive Status Report," August 1993, that included about 450 ACAT I through IV programs. The database is not on-line and the data are not accessible to most potential users. The Office of the Deputy Assistant of Air Force (Management Policy and Program Integration) initially provided disks with updated information to various Air Force organizations but discontinued distribution because recipients reportedly did not use them. Additionally, sections of the database that addressed funding and milestone review scheduling were being considered for deletion because the information was often unreliable.

In addition, Office of the Deputy Assistant of Air Force (Communication, Computers and Support Systems) representatives believed that an integrated information management system is needed. Further, the representatives indicated that a lack of standard data elements continues to pose serious problems and, until data standardization occurs, implementing a DoD-wide integrated information system will be difficult.

Military Department Program Executive Officers. Presently, information on ACAT I through IV programs is communicated manually. Most Program Executive Officers from the 29 Program Executive Offices that we examined did not use an integrated automated acquisition information management system to manage their programs and to provide decisionmakers with needed program information. However, the Program Executive Officers indicated that an integrated acquisition information management system does have merit (Appendix C).

Data Administration

The DoD Directive 8000.1 assigns the Defense Information Systems Agency the responsibility for developing and managing the DoD Data Administration Program and for providing DoD Components with information management expertise and supporting technical services. The DoD Data Administration Program Management Office (DAPMO) accomplishes the Defense Information Systems Agency's data administration responsibilities.

Status of the DoD Data Administration Program. According to DAPMO officials, the DAPMO is currently unable to meet data administration training needs because of insufficient funding. DAPMO officials indicated that the lack of funding has forced DAPMO to limit training to data administration trainers. Consequently, the data administration trainers are expected to advise the DoD organizations on how to implement data administration. In addition, the DAPMO believes that the DoD community is not readily accepting data administration because the concept is not intuitive, the payback is not immediate, and significant initial investment is required. Because of the poor quality of data that the current information dissemination process provides, DoD decisionmakers and other users of acquisition program information cannot make the best decisions. Information provided has been conflicting, obsolete, incomplete, non-integrable, and non-interoperable.

Adequacy of Data Administration. The DAPMO indicated that DoD organizations currently do not have adequate data administration programs. Consequently, decisionmakers could make uninformed decisions because they:

- are unaware when or whether a problem exists,
- do not know the severity of the problem,
- are unable to obtain program information necessary to solve the problem, and
- do not know whether the information is complete or correct.

DoD Data Administration Strategic Plan. On October 29, 1993, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Information Management approved the "DoD Data Administration Strategic Plan, FYs 1993 through 2000" (the Plan),

October 4, 1993. The Plan, updated annually, was developed as the primary planning document to guide the development, implementation, and management of the DoD Data Administration Program. The Plan describes the DoD data administration mission, scope, guiding principles, future concepts, goals, action plans over an 8-year period, and FY 1992 accomplishments. As one of its goals for improving DoD data administration, the Plan emphasizes that source data be entered at its origin electronically, whenever practical, without first being handwritten or typed. Data administration has evolved to include strategic data planning, information management control, data security, data synchronization, and database development and maintenance. Without these activities, effective data administration is not possible because data administration must:

o support DoD operations and decisionmaking with information that meets the need in terms of availability, accuracy, timeliness, and quality;

o structure the information systems to encourage horizontal and vertical sharing of data in the DoD; and

o enhance mission performance and information system interoperability.

Cause for Inadequate Acquisition Information Management

The present DoD acquisition information management program and data administration program for ACAT I through IV programs are not adequate because:

o information is not made available expeditiously to decisionmakers from a DoD-wide perspective to execute DoD acquisition programs effectively in accordance with DoD Directive 8000.1 and

o data elements are not standardized to meet the requirements for data sharing and interoperability among information systems throughout DoD in accordance with DoD Directive 8320.1.

DoD policy is that information is a corporate asset and should be structured to enable full interoperability and integration across DoD activities. In that regard, acquisition information is no different from logistics or finance data.

Effect of Existing Acquisition Information Management

The current DoD information management system needs improvement because an integrated, state-of-the-art acquisition information management system is not available to decisionmakers within the USD(A&T) and DoD Component Acquisition Executives. As a result, paperwork is excessive, the timespan needed for identification of risks and the implementation of corrective action is lengthened, and USD(A&T) functions are hampered.

Program Reviews and Briefings. USD(A&T) and DoD Component Acquisition Executive officials relied heavily on paperwork-intensive program reviews and briefings instead of on an acquisition information management system. The establishment of a less formal, but still reliable, means of forwarding information could reduce the number of program reviews and briefings because the information would be more readily available to decisionmakers.

Identifying Risks and Implementing Corrective Actions. Using the current manual system lengthened the process of identifying risks and implementing corrective actions. As a result of not having an integrated information management system, DoD experienced a proliferation of redundant databases in virtually all functional areas, including acquisition. The multiple acquisition information systems are not consistently providing milestone decision authorities and program managers the level of program information and support needed to make the most appropriate and timely decisions. Decisionmakers are provided untimely, inaccurate, and inconsistent program performance and status assessments. Decisionmakers within OSD and the Military Departments cannot assess performance of either individual acquisition programs or the DoD acquisition system as a whole. Further, indicators established with and based on the current information management system to identify risks within acquisition programs are not reliable. Therefore, determining and implementing appropriate corrective actions becomes more difficult.

Conclusion

Acquisition Information Management. An integrated acquisition information management system identifying and addressing ACAT I through IV programs within the respective Military Departments, as well as DoD-wide, is essential for effective acquisition management. OSD and DoD Component decisionmakers need current, accurate, and consistent information on Defense acquisition programs to make timely and correct decisions. All acquisition program information should be available to acquisition decisionmakers regardless of the program status.

Data Administration and Data Standardization. The lack of standardized data elements throughout DoD is a significant management problem. Without data standardization, establishing and maintaining an efficient management information infrastructure and an integrated acquisition information management system are virtually impossible. Likewise, the lack of data standardization results in an inefficient acquisition management process and inconsistent and inaccurate information. When reporting to or advising decisionmakers about acquisition programs, currently presented information is not reliable because certain inconsistently defined data elements and items for any given program may be omitted or reflected elsewhere.

Recommendation, Management Comments, and Audit Response

We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology establish improved, state-of-the-art information management and data administration programs for the DoD acquisition system based on a single integrated information system that provides clear, concise, consistent, and easily accessible data DoD-wide and standardization of data elements to meet the requirements for data sharing and interoperability among information systems throughout DoD in accordance with DoD Directive 8000.1, "Defense Information Management Program," October 27, 1992, and DoD Directive 8320.1, "DoD Data Administration," September 26, 1991.

Management Comments. We received comments to a draft of this report from the Director, Acquisition Program Integration, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. The Director stated that, in accordance with the CIM Program, an assessment will be conducted to determine the adequacy of information systems and functional process for the Systems Acquisition Management functional area, including the area covered by this report. He stated that our finding from this report will be a valuable input to the assessment and will be fully considered. However, he could not commit to the recommendation until a decision was made either to consolidate existing information systems and implement a migration system or develop new information systems. The Director stated that the decision depends on the findings from a review of the broader Systems Acquisition Management functional area, the availability of investment resources, and functional area proposals. The complete text of the Director's comments is in Part IV.

Audit Response. The Director's comments met the intent of our recommendation. However, since a commitment cannot be made to the audit recommendation until management decides either to consolidate existing information systems and implement a migration system or develop new information systems, we request that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology provide an estimated date for the information-systems decision.

Part III - Additional Information

Appendix A. Definitions of Terms

Acquisition Category. A classification established to facilitate decentralized decisionmaking and execution and compliance with statutorily imposed requirements. The categories determine the level of review, decision authority, and applicable procedures and range from I to IV.

Acquisition Program Baseline. Embodies the cost, schedule, and performance objectives for a program.

Automated Information System. A combination of information, computer, and telecommunications resources and other information technology and personnel resources that collect, record, process, store, communicate, retrieve, and display information.

Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System. A personal computer-based, modular, menu-driven computer software program used by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Military Departments to support acquisition information management and reporting functions for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. The software and associated documentation were designed to reflect the policy and guidance of the USD(A&T) in the preparation of baselines, Defense Acquisition Executive Summaries, Selected Acquisition Reports, and Unit Cost reports in accordance with DoD Manual 5000.2-M. The Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System combines both common and unique DAES and Selected Acquisition Reports components into a unified database from which DAES and Selected Acquisition Reports reports are printed. This system also includes a separate baseline module that provides a structured, automated system to import and view approved program baselines, enter proposed changes to approved baselines and related contract specifications, and print baseline reports.

Corporate Information Management Initiative. In October 1989, DoD initiated the Corporate Information Management (CIM) initiative to improve its ability to apply information management capabilities effectively in support of its mission. The CIM initiative was established as a business improvement process to reduce non-value-added work and costs within DoD. Because the CIM initiative aimed to consolidate and unify automation information systems, Congress strongly endorsed the initiative. Although the scope of the CIM initiative has been expanded to apply methods to other DoD business areas, we found no instances where the initiative had impacted the system acquisition program management process.

Data Administration. The responsibility for definition, organization, supervision, and protection of data within an organization. Data administration supports DoD operations and decisionmaking with data that meet the needs of availability, accuracy, timeliness, and quality and encourage horizontal, as well as vertical, sharing of data in DoD.

Data Element. A basic unit of information having a meaning and subcategories, referred to as data items, of distinct units and values.

Data Standardization. The process of reviewing and documenting the names, meanings, and characteristics of data elements so that all users of the data have a common, shared understanding of it.

Defense Acquisition Executive Summary. The principal mechanism the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology uses to track programs between milestone reviews. The summary report includes Acquisition Category I programs and programs subject to review by the senior DoD acquisition review board.

Department of Defense Acquisition System. A single uniform system by which all equipment, facilities, and services are planned, designed, developed, acquired, maintained, and disposed of within the DoD. The system encompasses establishing and enforcing policies and practices that govern acquisitions, to include documenting mission needs and establishing performance goals and baselines, determining and prioritizing resource requirements for acquisition programs, planning and executing acquisition programs, directing and controlling the acquisition review process, developing and assessing logistics implications, contracting, monitoring the execution status of approved programs, and reporting to Congress.

Functional Area. An area, such as personnel, that consists of one or more functional activities, such as recruiting, that in turn consists of one or more functional processes, such as interviewing.

Functional Process Improvement. An application of a structured methodology to define a function's objectives and a strategy for achieving those objectives. Also called business process reengineering.

Future Years Defense Program. The official DoD document that summarizes forces and resources associated with programs approved by the Secretary of Defense. Its three parts are the organizations affected, appropriations accounts, and the 11 major force programs. The primary data component of this document is the program element. The program element, which consists of seven digits, is an integrated combination of personnel, equipment, and facilities, which together constitute and identify military capability or support activity.

Information Management. The functional proponent's creation, usage, sharing, and disposition of data or information as corporate resources critical to the effective and efficient operation of functional activities consistent with information management guidance the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) issues. Information management includes structuring functional management improvement processes by OSD principal staff assistants to produce and control the use of data in functional activities, information resources management, and supporting information technology and information services. Some DoD Directive 8000.1 principles of information management are:

o The computing and communications infrastructure shall be transparent to the information systems that rely on it.

o Functional management shall be held accountable for all benefits and all directly controllable costs of developing and operating its information systems.

o Common definitions and standards for data shall exist DoD-wide.

o Data must be entered only once.

o The presentation between the user and the system shall be friendly and consistent.

Information System. The organized collection, processing, transmission, and dissemination of information, whether automated or manual.

Major Defense Acquisition Program. An Acquisition Category I program that is not a highly sensitive classified program and is:

o designated by the Under Secretary of Defense of Acquisition and Technology as a major Defense acquisition program or

o estimated to have an eventual total expenditure for research, development, acquisition, and evaluation of more than $300 million in FY 1990 constant dollars or an eventual total expenditure for procurement of more than $1.8 billion in FY 1990 constant dollars.

Migration System. An existing automated information system (AIS) or a planned and approved AIS that has been officially designated as the single AIS to support standard processes for a function. A migration system is designated (or selected) by the OSD principal staff assistant(s) and their Defense Component counterparts whose function(s) the system supports, with the coordination of the DoD Senior Information Management Official. Upon selection and deployment, the migration system becomes the single AIS baseline for incremental and evolutionary changes and technical enhancements that implement standard data and integrated databases.

OSD Principal Staff Assistants. The Under Secretaries of Defense; the Assistant Secretaries of Defense; the General Counsel of the DoD; the Inspector General, DoD; the Comptroller of the Department of Defense; the Assistants to the Secretary of Defense; and OSD Directors or equivalents who report directly to the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Standard Data Element. A data element registered in accordance with DoD Directive 8320.1 data administration procedures.

Appendix B. Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Concerning the CIM initiative, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued four reports and the Inspector General, DoD, issued a program evaluation.

General Accounting Office

Report No. GAO/AIMD/NSIAD-94-101 (OSD Case No. 9652), "Defense Management: Stronger Support Needed for Corporate Information Management Initiative To Succeed," April 12, 1994, determined that DoD's efforts to reengineer its business processes, standardize and integrate data, and improve its information systems under CIM have yielded mixed results. The DoD had some success in implementing CIM in certain functional areas; however, it had not determined how much was spent on CIM, ensured continuous top-management commitment, and obtained support among critical mid-level managers. The report concluded that effective implementation of the CIM initiative is critical to DoD improving its business processes, data, and information systems. If done successfully, billions of dollars can be saved. However, DoD's approach to managing the initiative was not working. The report recommended that:

o a management strategy and a strategic plan to guide CIM implementation and integration be developed,

o efforts to reengineer and integrate business processes and to standardize systems be balanced,

o migration systems be supported by sound economic and technical analyses,

o costs and benefits of major process and systems improvements be assessed, and

o plans consistent with the overall strategic plan's goals and objectives be established.

Although the report did not request or contain DoD management comments, the Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Analysis and Followup, Inspector General, DoD (Analysis and Followup), requested that DoD officials provide the status of DoD's actions in response to the recommendations. On August 30, 1994, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence provided GAO with the DoD management comments that partially or fully concurred with most of the report findings and partially or fully concurred with all report recommendations. However, the DoD management comments did not include a status of DoD's actions in response to the recommendations. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence indicated that GAO did

not acknowledge much of the progress made to carry out the concepts endorsed by GAO and that are a part of the Corporate Information Management initiative.

Report No. GAO/IMTEC-92-77 (OSD Case No. 9235), "Defense ADP [Automated Data Processing], Corporate Information Management Must Overcome Major Problems," September 14, 1992, determined that the CIM initiative was threatened by DoD's inability to change the long-standing, fundamental aspects of its culture and to determine whether the business process or technology became the driving force in managing Defense information. The GAO recommended overall that DoD redirect implementation of the CIM initiative to improve existing systems in the short term while preparing for business process improvement in the long term, including developing management policy that clearly delineates how the roles and responsibilities of OSD senior functional officials, the Services, and Defense agencies should change to implement the CIM initiative. The report did not contain any DoD management comments because, according to the report, GAO requested that DoD not provide any. Even though the report did not contain DoD management comments, the report indicated that DoD officials had expressed general disagreement with the conclusions and recommendations. DoD officials indicated that GAO did not give them an opportunity to review a draft report and present management comments even though the report gave the impression that DoD management comments were provided. Analysis and Followup indicated that DoD is encouraged by the overall support for the CIM initiative reflected by GAO. However, DoD believed that:

o GAO differs substantially from DoD in its interpretation of CIM concepts and

o GAO does not acknowledge DoD's progress in carrying out the CIM concepts, such as through policies and funding controls.

Analysis and Followup indicated that DoD is taking action to implement or has implemented the recommendations.

Report No. GAO/IMTEC-91-35 (OSD Case No. 8677), "Defense ADP, Corporate Information Management Faces Significant Challenges," April 22, 1991, stated that accomplishing CIM's long-term goals would take many years. The report also concluded that DoD should focus on redefining how it conducts business and develop standard information systems to support new business processes. The report did not contain any recommendations; therefore, audit follow-up actions were not necessary. In addition, the report did not contain DoD management comments because GAO did not request management comments. The report further indicated that its contents were discussed with DoD officials and the DoD officials views were incorporated into the report.

Report No. GAO/IMTEC-91-18 (OSD Case No. 8566), "Defense ADP, Corporate Information Management Savings Estimates Are Not Supported," February 22, 1991, determined that an estimated $2.2 billion in savings resulting from the CIM initiative was not based on an analysis of the number of existing systems or the time needed to develop standard systems. Instead, the

estimate was based on managerial judgment. The report did not contain any recommendations; therefore, audit follow-up actions were not necessary. In addition, the report did not contain DoD management comments because GAO did not request DoD management comments. The report further indicated that its contents were discussed with DoD officials and the DoD officials views were incorporated into the report. Specifically, the report indicated that:

o DoD officials agreed that the CIM estimates were based on managerial judgment and

o DoD and Military Department officials had begun to analyze functional areas to determine savings.

Office of the Inspector General, Department of Defense

Program Evaluation, "Evaluation of the Department of Defense Corporate Information Management Initiative," January 28, 1993, was issued in response to a request by the Director of Defense Information to assess the status of the CIM initiative within DoD. The evaluation determined that:

o even though the tasks associated with the January 10, 1991, CIM implementation plan had been completed or incorporated into ongoing duties and responsibilities, the institutionalization of the CIM initiative was severely hampered by the lack of an overall CIM plan;

o the Director of Defense Information had not adequately communicated the guidance and direction for CIM implementation and developed an effective consensus and support for the CIM initiative within DoD; and

o savings and associated budgeting requirements attributed to the CIM initiative were inadequately analyzed, documented, and reported.

The evaluation recommended that:

o the January 10, 1991, CIM implementation plan no longer be used;

o a definitive CIM business plan be developed and disseminated;

o the support and approval of the Secretary of Defense to establish a Defense Corporate Management Board be obtained;

o adequate economic analyses be conducted and documented to support CIM initiatives; and

o a tracking system be established to effectively identify budget and savings information related to CIM.

The evaluation neither requested nor contained DoD management comments. The Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, Inspector General, DoD, did not request followup on the evaluation's recommendations.

Appendix C. Results of Program Executive Officer Survey

To assess the availability of and the need for improved acquisition information management, we surveyed all program executive officers (PEOs) within each Military Department. We sent each PEO a questionnaire, dated January 25, 1994, requesting information about their present management information systems and whether those systems were automated. If the PEOs indicated that they were not using an automated integrated acquisition information management system, the survey included questions about the benefits that the PEOs could derive from a management information system if one were implemented.

Respondents. Of the 29 PEOs surveyed, 24 responded, indicating whether they used a management information system for oversight of their programs.

Users. Three (13 percent) of the respondents indicated that their organizations were presently using some type of management information system.

Non-users. The remaining 21 (87 percent) of the respondents indicated that their organizations did not use an automated management information system. Some of these respondents cited the Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System as the management information system used to manage their programs. However, the Consolidated Acquisition Reporting System is not a management tool but the mechanism through which program managers prepare the Defense Acquisition Executive Summaries, Service Acquisition Reports, and Acquisition Program Baselines.

Potential Benefits. We asked the PEOs what benefits an integrated acquisition information management system might provide them. Those responding indicated that such a system could:

- o track funds and cost, schedule, and performance of programs;
- o provide a management-enhancing tool for the program manager to review all aspects of programs under his cognizance;
- o enable individual deputy program managers to provide data from their work stations and update information routinely, as events occur;
- o provide uniform and timely reporting in the chain of command;
- o electronically distribute documents;
- o perform "what-if" scenarios;
- o improve communications;

- eliminate costs associated with mailing classified packages; and
- allow scheduling for interrelated or interdependent systems.

Appendix D. Navy's Acquisition Program Data Base

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition) (ASN[RDA]) developed the Navy's Acquisition Program Data Base (APDB). The APDB is a dynamic database of all Navy Acquisition Categories (ACAT) I through IV programs as well as non-ACAT programs as defined by non-acquisition program decision documents. This centralized database replaces various Naval organizations' fragmented databases. According to the Office of the ASN(RDA), the primary purpose of the APDB was to disseminate the official list of Navy acquisition programs as required by DoD Instruction 5000.2, "Defense Acquisition Policies and Procedures," February 23, 1991.

In addition to other capabilities, the Navy APDB can:

o access Defense Acquisition Board documents, such as the cost and operational effectiveness analyses, acquisition program baselines, mission needs statements, operational requirements documents, and test and evaluation master plans, in their entirety;

o validate ACAT designations based on total program cost;

o include funding by appropriation, program element, line item, and other items; and

o provide the name, title, and organization of the milestone decision authority.

The database was designed to permit all users to view and extract information from all data fields and authorized personnel from the Offices of the ASN(RDA) and the Chief of Naval Operations, resource sponsors, systems commanders, and PEO and direct reporting program manager organizations to edit or update its contents. Except for the Office of the ASN(RDA) and some acquisition support organizations, we found no instances where users were on-line to the APDB. Also, to update program information in the APDB and the databases at acquisition support organizations, program managers must still provide hard copy documents to the Office of the ASN(RDA) and the support offices.

Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Amount and/or Type of Benefit
1.	Program Results. Will ensure the establishment of effective acquisition information management for Acquisition Categories I through IV programs.	Nonquantifiable because the benefits depend on future OSD actions.

Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, Washington, DC
  Director, Acquisition Program Integration, Washington, DC
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence), Washington, DC
Comptroller of the Department of Defense, Washington, DC
Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, Washington, DC

Department of the Army

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition), Washington, DC
  Program Executive Office, Armaments, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ
  Program Executive Office, Armored Systems Modernization, Warren, MI
  Program Executive Office, Aviation, St. Louis, MO
  Program Executive Office, Combat Support, Warren, MI
  Program Executive Office, Command and Control Systems, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  Program Executive Office, Communications Systems, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  Program Executive Office, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare, Warrenton, VA
  Program Executive Office, Missile Defense, Arlington, VA
Army Materiel Command, Alexandria, VA

Department of the Navy

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Washington, DC
  Marine Corps Systems Command, Quantico, VA
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition), Washington, DC
  Program Executive Office, Air Antisubmarine Warfare, Assault and Special Mission Programs, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Cruise Missiles Project and Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Joint Project, Washington, DC
  Program Executive Office, Joint Advanced Strike Technology, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Mine Warfare, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Space Communications and Sensors, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Submarines, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Tactical Air Programs, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Theater Air Defense, Arlington, VA
  Program Executive Office, Undersea Warfare, Arlington, VA

Department of the Navy (Continued)

Direct Reporting Program Manager, AEGIS, Arlington, VA
Direct Reporting Program Manager, Advanced Amphibious Assault, Washington, DC
Direct Reporting Program Manager, Advanced Tactical Aircraft, Advanced Medium Attack, Arlington, VA
Direct Reporting Program Manager, Strategic Systems Program, Arlington, VA
Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington, VA
Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, VA
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, VA

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition), Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Bombers, Missiles and Trainers, Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Combat Support System, Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Command, Control and Communication, Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Conventional Strike Programs, Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Space Programs, Washington, DC
Program Executive Office, Tactical Airlift Programs, Washington, DC
Air Force Material Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, TX
Aeronautical Systems Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, TX

Defense Agencies

Defense Information Systems Agency, Arlington, VA
Defense Logistics Agency, Alexandria, VA
Defense Contract Management Command, Alexandria, VA

Appendix G. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
  Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology)
    Director, Acquisition Program Integration
  Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence)
Comptroller of the Department of Defense
  Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation
Director, Operational Test and Evaluation
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

Department of the Army

Secretary of the Army
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition)
Army Materiel Command
Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Secretary of the Navy
Commandant of the Marine Corps
  Marine Corps Systems Command
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management)
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition)
Comptroller of the Navy
Naval Air Systems Command
Naval Sea Systems Command
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition)
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Air Force Materiel Command
  Aeronautical Systems Center
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Defense Agencies

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Information Systems Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
  Commander, Defense Contract Management Command
Director, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Central Imagery Office
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency
Inspector General, National Security Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Non-Defense Organizations

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office

Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of Each of the Following Congressional Committees and Subcommittees:

  Senate Committee on Appropriations
  Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
  Senate Committee on Armed Services
  Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
  House Committee on Appropriations
  House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
  House Committee on Armed Services
  House Committee on Government Operations
  House Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, Committee on Government Operations

Part IV - Management Comments

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Comments

ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-3000

30 AUG 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

SUBJECT: Draft Audit Report on DoD Acquisition Information Management (Project No. 3AE-0061.02)

The subject report recommends that the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) "establish improved, state of the art information management and data administration programs for the DoD acquisition system based on a single integrated information system that provides clear, concise, consistent, and easily accessible data DoD-wide."

In accordance with the CIM program, Acquisition and Technology currently has in draft a charter for a Systems Acquisition Management (SAM) CIM effort. The SAM CIM will assess the adequacy of information systems, and functional processes, for the full sweep of the Systems Acquisition Management functional area, including the area covered by the subject report. Your findings will be a valuable input for that assessment and will be fully considered. The decision whether to consolidate existing information systems and implement a migration system or to develop new information systems will be made in the context of available resources and the expected savings that would accrue from the specific alternatives. Because the decision depends very directly on both the findings from a review of the broader Systems Acquisition Management functional area, the availability of investment resources, and the expected return from proposals for this functional area and other functional areas, a commitment with respect to your recommendation would be premature.

L.N. Blickstein
Director, Acquisition
Program Integration

Audit Team Members

Donald E. Reed
Russell A. Rau
John E. Meling
Jack D. Snider
Alvin B. Lowe
Matthew G. Johnson
Mary Ann Hourclé
Teresa D. Bone